



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/696,609	10/24/2000	Klaus Hofrichter	SONY-50N3765	3968
7590 Sheryl Sue Holloway Blakely, Sokoloff, Taylor & Zafman LLP 12400 Wilshire Boulevard, Seventh Floor Los Angeles, CA 90024		02/23/2007	EXAMINER SALCE, JASON P	
			ART UNIT 2623	PAPER NUMBER

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	02/23/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/696,609	HOFRICHTER ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Jason P. Salce	2623	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20 December 2006.
 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-14, 16-24 and 26-35 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1-14, 16-24, 26-35 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 12/20/2006 has been entered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1 – 4, 6 – 9, 11 – 14, 16 – 19, 21 – 24, 26 – 29, 31 and 34-35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sezan et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,236,395) in view of Eyer et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,401,242).

Regarding claim 1, Sezan discloses a method and a computer readable medium for enabling an electronic device for automated management of a on-site storage device (see col 6 lines 23 – 39 and col 7 lines 7 – 40). Sezan discloses receiving and radio and video programs and recoding the programs (see col 7 lines 7 – 38, col 6 lines 23 – 39). Sezan further discloses receiving context data describing the

received programs (see description scheme – col 5 lines 33 – 46, col 6 lines 1 – 38 and col 9 lines 13 – 48). In addition, Sezan discloses, “*The system description scheme 22 preferably manages the individual programs and other data*” (see col. 6 lines 23 – 25). Sezan further discloses “*...the system description scheme will be capable of storing the information contained within the program description scheme, so that information is properly indexed. With proper indexing, the system is capable of matching such information with user information, if available, for obtaining and recording suitable programs*” (see col. 7 lines 18 – 24). Thus Sezan discloses an executable system description scheme which is used for storing and managing programs and other data i.e. content data and context data. It is noted that the managing and indexing is done without requiring user input. Sezan also discloses “*The system, in an autonomous manner, periodically obtains and records the audiovisual information that may be of interest to the user...*” (see col. 9 lines 48 – 52) and thus discloses storing without requiring user input.

Although Sezan teaches using different versions of the received description data (see Column 16, Lines 41-46), Sezan is silent as to a memory management method, which updates the versions of the description data by replacing outdated versions stored in memory.

Eyer discloses transmitting different versions of description data and replacing the outdated version when a newer version of the description data is received (see Column 21, Lines 8-18).

At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the description data storage, as taught by Sezan, using the version replacement process, as taught by Eyer, for the purpose of providing a scheme used for memory allocation and management (see Column 21, Lines 16-18 of Sezan) which prevents memory overflow.

Regarding claim 2, Sezan inherently discloses the claimed processor and computer readable memory as required to perform the function of automated management of data stored on the storage medium (see col 6 lines 23 – 39, col 6 line 63 – col 7 line 40).

Regarding claims 3, 13 and 23, Sezan discloses "*It is preferred to maintain the program description scheme separate from the system description scheme because the content providers repackage the content and description schemes in different styles, times and formats*" (see col. 7 lines 40 – 45) and thus discloses a storage management service provider located remotely from said media storage device.

Regarding claim 4, Sezan discloses the claimed managing content data and context data of media signal stored on the media storage device according to storage management instructions (see col 9 lines 1- 7, col 9 line 40 – col 10 line 37, col 7 lines 7 – 38).

Art Unit: 2623

Regarding claims 6 and 8, Sezan discloses deleting of stored programs and writing of programs (see col 11 lines 50 – 67) per a user description profile scheme and the system description scheme. It is noted that the system description scheme is used for the recording or writing of new media signal (see col. 7 lines 16 – 49) thus Sezan discloses the claimed “allowing overwriting of a new media signal over a media signal recorded onto said media storage device in accordance with said storage management instructions”.

Regarding claim 7, Sezan discloses receiving user preferences from said on-site user (see col 5 lines 37-45, col 9 lines 40 – 50).

Regarding claims 9 and 31, Sezan discloses “*the system description scheme may be transported to the source to provide the source with view or other capabilities that the device with image, audio and/or video content customized or otherwise suitable for the particular device*” (see col. 8 lines 1 – 8) and also discloses “*...because the content providers repackage the content and description schemes in different styles, times and formats*” and thus discloses the claimed limitations.

updating the description schemes (see col 6 lines 1 – 6, col 9 lines 9 – 25).

Claims 11 and 21, are met by the discussions above.

Regarding claims 12 and 22, Sezan discloses enabling the storage management instructions to execute on the on-site media storage device (see col 6 lines 23 – 39, col 6 line 63 – col 7 line 40).

Claims 14, 16, 18, 19, 24, 26, 28 and 29 are met by the discussions above.

Regarding claims 17 and 27, Sezan discloses a system description scheme records programs based on preference data in user description scheme (see col. 9 lines 41 – 52, col. 7 lines 7 – 15).

Referring to claims 34-35, Sezan teaches that the context data is received at said on-site media storage device (see Figure 2).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 5, 10, 15, 20, 25 and 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sezan et al (6,236,395) in view of Eyer et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,401,242) in further view of Kunkel et al (US 2002/0056093).

Regarding claims 5, 10, 20 and 30, Sezan and Eyer fail to disclose providing context-sensitive management and wherein the storage management instructions are capable of managing a discrete context-content clip of data.

In analogous art, Kunkel teaches a system which filters additional descriptive information at the set-top box according to demographic information for the benefit of providing more targeted additional information. Therefore, it would have been obvious to an artisan skilled in the art at the time of the invention to include managing the context of description scheme in Sezan and Eyer for the benefit of targeting and thus providing descriptive information that a user would find more interesting or useful.

4. Claims 32 and 33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sezan et al (6,236,395) in view of Eyer et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,401,242) in further view of Kenner et al (US 5,956,716).

Regarding claims 32 and 33, as discussed above, Sezan and Eyer disclose receiving executable storage management instructions at a media storage device to record a program by receiving context data associated with the program, wherein the storage management instructions instruct the media storage device to store the program and automatically executing the received storage management instructions without requiring a user input. Sezan and Eyer fails to disclose receiving an updated version of a particular one of a plurality of clips of a program stored at a media storage device and using the management instructions to store one of the plurality of clips.

Kenner teaches storing video clips at a user device. Kenner further recognizes the video clips stored may not be current and thus teaches providing updated clips to a user device (see col. 5 lines 1 – 15, col. 28 lines 59 – 65).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Sezan and Eyer to include the claimed limitations for the benefit of providing a user with the most up-to-date and recent clips and programming.

Regarding claim 33, the combination of Sezan and Kenner teaches the claimed limitation. It is noted that since Kenner teaches receiving a displaying a updated clip, necessarily the user can output a program before the updated clip is received or can also output the program after the updated clip is received.

Conclusion

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jason P. Salce whose telephone number is (571) 272-7301. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9am-6pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Miller can be reached on (571) 272-7353. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Jason P Salce
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2623

February 20, 2007

JASON SALCE
PRIMARY PATENT EXAMINER

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Jason Salce".